YITP-16-93

Inspecting non-perturbative contributions to the Entanglement Entropy via wavefunctions

Arpan Bhattacharyya[a,d], Ling-Yan Hung[a,b,c], P.H.C. Lau[e] and Si-Nong Liu[a]

[a] *Department of Physics and Center for Field Theory and Particle Physics, Fudan University, 220 Handan Road, 200433 Shanghai, China*

[b] *State Key Laboratory of Surface Physics and Department of Physics, Fudan University, 220 Handan Road, 200433 Shanghai, China*

[c] *Collaborative Innovation Center of Advanced Microstructures, Nanjing University, Nanjing, 210093, China.*

[d] *Centre For High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, 560012 Bangalore, India*

[e] *Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kitashirakawa Oiwakecho Sakyo-ku, Kyoto City, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

arXiv:1608.00145v1 [hep-th] 30 Jul 2016

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we would like to systematically explore the implications of non-perturbative effects on entanglement in a many body system. Instead of pursuing the usual path-integral method in a singular space, we attempt to study the wavefunctions in detail. We begin with a toy model of multiple particles whose interaction potential admits multiple minima. We study the entanglement of the true ground state after taking the tunnelling effects into account and find some simple patterns. Notably, in the case of multiple particle interactions, entanglement entropy generically decreases with increasing number of minima. The knowledge of the subsystem actually increases as the number of minima increases. The reduced density matrix can also be seen to have close connections with graph spectra. In a more careful study of the two-well tunnelling system, we also extract the exponentially suppressed tail contribution, the analogues of instantons. To understand the effects of multiple minima in a field theory, it inspires us to inspect wavefunctions in a toy model of fermionic field describing quasi-particles of two different condensates related by Bogoliubov transformations. We find that the area law is naturally preserved. This is probably a useful set of perspectives that promise wider applications.

August 2, 2016

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Toy example of a 2-particle system **3**

2.1 Generalisation to multiple minima 5

2.2 Generalisation to many particles with two minima 6

3 Tunnelling and entanglement entropy **10**

3.1 Set-up 10

4 Free Majorana fermions **13**

5 Interpretation **17**

6 Discussions **18**

A Appendix **19**

A.1 False vacuum tunnelling 19

A.2 Multi-particle 21

A.3 Double well tunnelling revisited 23

1 Introduction

The study of many body entanglement has given us insights into new phases of matter, leading to a classification of topological orders beyond the Landau paradigm [1, 2, 3]. Entanglement entropy has also breathed new life into the study of quantum gravity. Efforts to understand the Ryu-Takayanagi formula [4, 5] that computes entanglement entropy in the AdS/CFT correspondence has led to novel perspectives that connect the duality to tensor-networks [6, 7]. The latter surprisingly captures many of the salient features of the correspondence. In high energy physics, the default framework has been quantum field theory. Given the importance in understanding the entanglement pattern

of a many-body system[1], it is thus of fundamental significance to understand what kind of entanglement can be supported by quantum field theory in principle.

As the most broad-stroke qualitative question, it is natural to ask whether the entanglement entropy of the ground state of a local field theory always satisfies an area law. There is overwhelming evidence that this is indeed the case, from both numerical studies and exact calculations in field theories, such as CFTs in 1+1 dimensions, free theories and large N theories [21, 22, 23, 25, 25, 26] in which the calculation becomes manageable. There are also perturbative calculations in theories such as ϕ^4 theory [27, 28] that provide some insights into the correction to the entanglement entropies from some weak interactions. On the other hand, we have the AdS/CFT correspondence that allows one to probe into the strongly coupled regime of the field theory [5, 29].

There are various aspects that still remain unsatisfactory. For one, the corrections included in these computations are predominantly perturbative. Also, the entanglement entropy is a rather crude probe of entanglement. It misses many minute details of the actual pattern of entanglement that could only be explored with a better control of the entanglement spectrum, such as in the classic example of topological orders [30], and more recently, in identifying chaotic states [31]. Moreover, the entanglement entropy has to be computed via the replica trick [21, 22], which, given its technical difficulty, easily masks the physics. After all, the calculation does not directly provide insights of entanglement between physical degrees of freedom. Rather, it relies on heavy machinery that introduces singularities into a path-integral. The procedure of regulating subsequent divergences can potentially mask the true underlying physics.

In this paper, we are motivated by the intention of studying non-perturbative contributions to the entanglement entropy, and understand, at least in some special contexts, what role they play in the entanglement of the ground state. One of the most important non-perturbative corrections to field theory comes from instantons, which are extra (topologically) non-trivial saddles in the (Euclidean) path-integral. However, it is not entirely obvious how they alter the entanglement structure of the ground state. To address the question, we follow here the more intuitive path of focusing on the wavefunction. It is well understood that instantons describe tunnelling events between local minima, and that we are only capable of employing perturbation theory systematically around each of these minima. Instantons have been explored in a wide range of theories, from ϕ^4 theories with 2 minima to Abelian and non-Abelian gauge theories such as the QCD [32, 33, 34] with essentially infinitely many minima. In the case of the ϕ^4 theory (in a compact space), instantons describe tunnelling events between the two minima [32]. In QCD, the study of tunnelling allows one to identify the θ-vacua [33, 34]. The true ground state is in fact a linear combination of the naive vacua obtained by perturbing around one of the minima of the potential.

[1]Interested readers are referred to some of these references [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. The list is by no means complete and interested readers are requested to see to the references and citations of these papers.

Motivated by these considerations, we begin with a study of a simple quantum mechanical problem, in which multiple particles enjoy an interaction potential that has multiple minima. The true ground state is a linear combination of states where each one is a peak around one minimum. In these cases, the reduced density matrix can be obtained explicitly, giving a complete picture of the entanglement structure of the true ground state. Along the way, we find an amusing connection between the spectra of the reduced density matrices and the Cartan matrices of the A_n Lie groups. The relation between these is part of a wider connection between the entanglement spectrum and graph spectra [35, 36, 37], where the adjacency matrix of some graphs describes hopping between different states in the reduced density matrix.

Then we move onto field theory. To borrow the insights obtained from the quantum mechanical problem, we start with the true ground states of a theory with multiple minima after taking tunnelling into account. Instead of working directly with instantons, we play the same game of writing down linear combinations of states, each of which corresponding to a wavefunction peaked around one of the minima. To do so, we select a reference basis state defined perturbatively around one minimum. This is a complete set of basis states where the perturbative vacuum defined around another minimum can be related to the reference set of states by a Bogoliubov transformation [38, 39, 40, 41, 42]. We will demonstrate these explicitly using a set of Majorana fermions in 1+1 dimensions as an example. For ϕ^4 theories, it is more natural to work with bosons, but the situation can be considered as fermionic quasi-particle excitations around different minima where each of them corresponds to a superconducting condensate [41, 42]. Using this method, one could explicitly see that the area law is expected to be preserved, even with instanton corrections, as also observed using direct field theoretic computation employing the replica trick [43].

2 Toy example of a 2-particle system

Let us begin with a warm-up exercise studying the entanglement between 2 particles, located at x_1 and x_2, interacting via a potential $V(x_1-x_2)$. The 2-particle time-independent Schrödinger equation is given by [44]

$$H\left|\Psi_n(x_1,x_2)\right\rangle = E_n\left|\Psi_n(x_1,x_2)\right\rangle, \tag{2.1}$$

with the hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{1}{2m_1}\partial_{x_1}^2 - \frac{1}{2m_2}\partial_{x_2}^2 + V(x_1-x_2). \tag{2.2}$$

To illustrate the idea, we will take $V(x)$ to be a function with 2 minima located at $x = x_1 - x_2 = 0$ and $x = a$. The center of mass behaves like a free particle. Suppose the potential is extremely narrow and deep near $x = 0$, a, and that $V(0) = V(a) = 0$,

then the ground state in the center of mass frame is simply given by a wavefunction that is an equal weighted sum of delta functions peaking at $x = 0$ and $x = a$. The low lying eigenfunctions take the form,

$$|\Psi_k(x_1, x_2)\rangle = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{x_1,x_2} e^{ikX} \left(|x = 0\rangle + |x = a\rangle\right), \qquad X = \frac{m_1 x_1 + m_2 x_2}{(m_1 + m_2)} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is the appropriate normalisation and the true ground state is located $k = 0$. x_1, x_2 are discretised such that the integrations over x_1 and x_2 are replaced by summations.

The density matrix constructed from $|\Psi_k\rangle$ is given by $\rho = |\Psi_k\rangle \langle\Psi_k|$, and the reduced density matrix upon integrating out particle 2 is given by

$$\rho_1 = \mathcal{N}^2 \sum_{x_1} \left(|x_1\rangle \langle x_1| + \frac{1}{2}(e^{ika} |x_1\rangle \langle x_1 + a| + e^{-ika} |x_1\rangle \langle x_1 - a|) \right), \tag{2.4}$$

which explicitly has unit trace.

The off-diagonal terms are essentially hopping terms. Note that for a potential $V(x)$ with a single minimum, the reduced density matrix corresponds to a maximally entangled state where we have no knowledge of particle 2.

Here, we would like to pause and note that at $k = 0$, this reduced density matrix is precisely proportional to the Cartan matrix of A_N, where N is now given by the total number of sites of the discretised system. The Cartan matrix of A_N is equal to $2\mathbb{I} - R$, where R is the adjacency matrix of the Dynkin diagram of A_N defined by [2]

$$R_{ij} = 1, \qquad i = j \pm 1. \tag{2.5}$$

It is not surprising that the reduced density matrix is connected to graphs. The Cartan matrix is connected to positive definite matrices, which alone is a good reason why it should show up as reduced density matrices. We leave this important and fun topic for future work.

To compute the entanglement entropy, we use the replica trick and compute $\mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_1^n$. This is a combinatorics problem asking for the number of ways to hop n steps and returning to the starting point. The number of steps in $+a$ must equal the number of $-a$ steps. Suppose they are m, then we are taking $(n - m)$ steps hopping on the same spot. The contribution to $\mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_1^n$ from such a term is

$$f_n(m) = \mathcal{N}^{2n} \frac{n!}{m!m!(n - 2m)!} \frac{1}{2^{2m}}. \tag{2.6}$$

[2] The adjacency matrix R of a graph is defined such that a matrix element R_{ij} counts the number of links connecting the two nodes labeled i and j. For a best beginner's review of graph spectra, see for example Wikipedia [45] and references therein.

Then altogether we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_1^n = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^2}\sum_{m=0}^{|n/2|} f_n(m)\,. \tag{2.7}$$

This is evaluated formally and gives

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_1^n = \mathcal{N}^{2(n-1)}\Big(\frac{2^n\Gamma(n+\frac{1}{2})}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(n+1)}\Big). \tag{2.8}$$

The entanglement entropy for two minima is

$$S_{EE}^2 = \lim_{n\to 1}\frac{\ln(\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_1^n)}{1-n} = -2\ln(\mathcal{N}) - 1 + \gamma + \psi^{(0)}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right), \tag{2.9}$$

where γ and $\psi^{(0)}$ denotes the Euler Gamma function and the Polygamma function, respectively.
Now we compare it with the case when there is only one minimum

$$\rho_1 = \mathcal{N}^2\sum_{x_1}|x_1\rangle\langle x_1|\,. \tag{2.10}$$

The entanglement entropy for a single minimum is

$$S_{EE}^1 = -2\ln(\mathcal{N}). \tag{2.11}$$

So the change in entanglement entropy between this two cases is

$$\Delta S_{EE} = S_{EE}^1 - S_{EE}^2 = 0.306853\,. \tag{2.12}$$

There is a reduction of entanglement. In the next section, we will generalise to the case of arbitrary number of minima.

2.1 Generalisation to multiple minima

The previous calculation can be generalised to the case where the potential $V(x)$ has N minima, located at $\{L_i\}$, $1 \le i \le N$. The reduced density matrix is

$$\rho_1(N) = \mathcal{N}^2\sum_{x_1}\left(|x_1\rangle\langle x_1| + \frac{1}{N}\left(\sum_{i\neq j} e^{ik(L_i-L_j)}|x_1\rangle\langle x_1 + (L_i - L_j)|\right)\right)\,. \tag{2.13}$$

Now we apply the replica trick and compute $\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_1^n$. For simplicity, and in fact generically, $L_{ij} = L_i - L_j$ are not multiples of each other, and there are thus $N(N-1)/2$ distinct hopping step sizes.

$$n_0 + \sum_{i,j} n_{ij} = n, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\sum_{i,j} n_{ij}(L_i - L_j) = 0.\,, \tag{2.15}$$

where n_0 is the number of standstill hops.

The L_{ij}, $i \neq j$ are not independent and satisfy the constraint

$$\sum_{ij}(L_i - L_j) = 0\,. \tag{2.16}$$

The contribution from each such set of closed paths is given by

$$f_n(\{n_{ij}\}) = \mathcal{N}^{2n}\frac{n!}{N^{n-n_0}\, n_0!\, \prod_{i>j}(n_{ij}!)^2}\,. \tag{2.17}$$

For simplicity, let us compute the case of $n = 2$ which gives us the tightest lower bound on the entanglement entropy. For $n = 2$, the only allowed hopping is to take either $n_{ij} = n_{ji} = 1$, $n_0 = 0$, or $n_0 = 2$ which gives

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_1^2 = \mathcal{N}^2\left(1 + \frac{N(N-1)}{N^2}\right) = \mathcal{N}^2\left(2 - \frac{1}{N}\right). \tag{2.18}$$

We note that the entanglement entropy must be a monotonically decreasing function of N, the number of minima. It follows from the fact that with more minima, we actually gain knowledge of the first particle.

2.2 Generalisation to many particles with two minima

Particles on a ring: periodic boundary condition

In this section we generalise the previous calculation to N particles with a potential $V(x)$ admitting only two minima. For simplicity we set $k = 0$ here. We consider a set-up where these N particles are placed on a ring, i.e. with a periodic boundary condition. The wavefunction is given by

$$|\psi(x_1, x_2, \cdots x_N)\rangle = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{\sqrt{N!}}\sum_{\Delta_{ij}}\Big(\,|x_1, \Delta_{ij} = 0\rangle + |x_1, \Delta_{ij} = a, -a\rangle\,\Big)\,, \tag{2.19}$$

where, $i, j \geq 1$. Δ_{ij} denotes the separation between the particles i and j and $\sum_{x_1}|x_1, \Delta_{ij} = a, -a\rangle$ denotes all the configurations when any one of the $\Delta_{ij} = x_i - x_j$ are non zero and equal to a. The periodic boundary condition implies $\sum_{i,j}\Delta_{ij} = 0$ which gives a very tight constraint. Since $\Delta_{ij}\ \forall\, i, j$ can only take values either a or 0, this constraint implies either all $\Delta_{ij} = 0$ or only one of them can be non-vanishing and take value $\Delta_{ij} = a$ when



Figure 1: N particles on a ring. $x_1, x_2 \cdots x_N$ denote the positions of these particles. a denotes the separation between any two particles. Dashed line in red denotes that the first m particles are traced out when we compute the reduced density matrix.

$i < j \; \forall i, j = 1 \cdots N$. The latter automatically forces $\Delta_{x_N, x_1} = -a$. We further simplify the form of the wavefunction by taking x_1 as the reference point

$$|\psi >= \frac{\mathcal{N}}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_{\Delta_{ij}} \Big(|\psi_1(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle + |\psi_2(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle + |\psi_3(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle + |\psi_4(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle \Big) , \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_1(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle =& |x_1, \Delta_{ij} = 0 \; \forall i, j \leq m\rangle \otimes \\
& \Big|x_1, \Delta_{x_m, x_{m+1}} = 0, \Delta_{x_N, x_1} = 0, \; \Delta_{ij} = 0 \; \forall \, i, j = x_{m+1} \cdots x_N \Big\rangle \; , \\
|\psi_2(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle =& |x_1, \Delta_{ij} = 0 \; \forall \, i, j \leq m\rangle \otimes \\
& \Big|x_1, \Delta_{x_m, x_{m+1}} = a, \Delta_{x_N, x_1} = -a, \Delta_{ij} = 0 \; \forall \, i, j = x_{m+1} \cdots x_N \Big\rangle \; , \\
|\psi_3(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle =& |x_1, \Delta_{ij} = 0 \; \forall \, i, j \leq m\rangle \otimes \\
& \Big|x_1, \Delta_{x_{m,m+1}} = 0, \Delta_{x_N, x_1} = -a, \Delta_{ij} = a \; \forall \, i, j = x_{m+1} \cdots x_N \Big\rangle \; , \\
|\psi_4(x_1, \Delta_{ij})\rangle =& |x_1, \Delta_{ij} = a \; \forall \, i, j \leq m\rangle \otimes \\
& \Big|x_1, \Delta_{x_N, x_1} = -a, \; \Delta_{x_i, x_j} = 0 \; \forall \, i, j = x_m \cdots x_N \Big\rangle \; .
\end{aligned}$$

Now the reduced density matrix can be computed by integrating out the first m particles

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_A = \frac{\mathcal{N}^2}{N!} \Big(& (m-1) | x_m = x_1 + a, \Delta_{x_m x_{m+1}} = 0, \Delta_{x_N x_1} = -a >< x_m = x_1 + a, \Delta_{x_m x_{m+1}} = 0, \\
& \Delta_{x_N x_1} = -a| + [|x_m = x_1, \Delta_{x_m x_{m+1}} = 0, \Delta_{x_N x_1} = 0 > + |x_m = x_1 + a, \Delta_{x_m x_{m+1}} = 0, \\
& \Delta_{x_N x_1} = -a > + |x_m = x_1, \Delta_{x_m x_{m+1}} = a, \Delta_{x_N, x_1} = -a >][\text{c.c}] \Big),
\end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where c.c denotes the complex conjugate. Up to an overall normalisation factor

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_A^2 = 2[(m-1)^2 + 2(m-1) + \frac{N^2}{2} - N(m-1) + 1]. \tag{2.22}$$

Finally the second Rényi entropy is

$$S_2 = -\ln(\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_A^2)\,. \tag{2.23}$$

Note that we have used the fact that there are $(m-1)$ configurations corresponding to $|x_1\rangle$ and $(N-m)$ configurations corresponding to $|\alpha_i\rangle$.

Particles on a Line: without periodic boundary condition



Figure 2: N particles on a rod. $(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_N)$ denote the positions of these particles. Δ_{ij} denotes the separation between particles i and j. The first m particles are traced out when we compute the reduced density matrix.

This section considers N particles on a rod. The configuration is illustrated in Figure 2. The set-up is almost identical to the previous calculation but a periodic boundary condition is not imposed here. Hence, there is no constraint on these $\Delta_{ij} = x_i - x_j$, and they can take values independently of each other. We define $\sum_{i,j=1}^{m-1}\Delta_{ij} = L$ and $\sum_{i,j=m+1}^{N}\Delta_{ij} = M$. Also $\Delta_{m-1\,m}$ can either take a value of a or 0. The wavefunction can be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \mathcal{N}\sum_{L,M}\Big(\,|x_1, L\rangle\otimes|x_M = x_1 + L, m\rangle + |x_1, L\rangle\otimes|x_m = x_1 + L + a, M\rangle\,\Big). \tag{2.24}$$

The reduced density matrix is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A =& \operatorname{Tr}_{1\cdots m} |\psi\rangle \langle\psi| \\ =& \mathcal{N}^2 \sum_{M,M',L=0}^{L=(m-1)a} \langle x_1, L|x_1, L'\rangle \\ & \times \Big[|x_m = x_1 + L, M\rangle \langle x_m = x_+ L, M'| \\ & \quad + |x_m = x_1 + L + a, M\rangle \langle x_m = x_1 + L + a, M'| \\ & \quad + |x_m = x_1 + L, M\rangle \langle x_m = x_1 + L + a, M'| \\ & \quad + |x_m = x_1 + L + a, M\rangle \langle x_m = x_1 + L, M'| \Big] .\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

After some simplification, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A = \mathcal{N}^2 \sum_{M,M',L=0}^{L=(m-1)a} \Gamma(L)^2 \Big[& 2\ |x_m, M\rangle \langle x_m, M'| \\ & + |x_m, M\rangle \langle x_m + a, M'| \\ & + |x_m, M\rangle \langle x_m - a, M'| \Big] ,\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

where $\Gamma(L)^2$ denotes all possible linear combinations of states. Finally, the reduced density matrix after summing over L and L' is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A = \mathcal{N}^2 \Delta \sum_{M,M'} \Big[& 2\ |x_m, M\rangle \langle x_m, M'| \\ & + |x_m, M\rangle \langle x_m + a, M'| \\ & + |x_m, M\rangle \langle x_m - a, M'| \Big] .\end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

This is almost the same as the 2-particle case in previous section except only with the extra factor of Δ which counts the degeneracy of the states. From this the computation of $n = 2$ Rényi entropy follows as before.

One of the most important message from this calculation is that only the particles right next to the cut is responsible for the entanglement, as is testified by the form of the reduced density matrix. Therefore, the entanglement cannot exceed the dimension of the Hilbert space at site m, and therefore we can interpret this strictly as an "area law" in the 1 dimensional chain of particles. In this case the potential between particles is a rigid well where perturbation is not possible, and it resembles a gapped 1d system. The linear combination of states that represents the true ground state as a result of tunnelling, at the end, surprisingly did not lead to more but less entanglement!

3 Tunnelling and entanglement entropy

To complete our discussion of quantum mechanical caricature of instantons, let us now make slightly less approximations, so that notions of instantons feature more obviously and prominently. We will now investigate the situation when there is tunnelling between two square wells through a potential wall with a finite width. The exponential tail in the wavefunction is precisely equivalent to what we call the action of instantons, which we will discuss in closer detail in [43] to make a detailed comparison with the corresponding field theoretic studies. Here we want to investigate the entropy dependence on the width of the wall, and justify the approximations taken in the previous sections, up to this small exponentially suppressed correction. The main goal of this section is to mimic the situation of false vacuum decay [32] and get as much intuition as possible for the effect of tunnelling on the entanglement, particularly, how the exponentially suppressed tail first features in the time dependence.

3.1 Set-up

Consider two square wells each of width $(b-a)$ are separated by a barrier of width $2a$. We would like to study states very close to the ground states. As is well known, there are two almost degenerate states, with the first excited states splitted from the ground state by exponential factors of the width of the potential barrier. The true ground state has even parity and the first excited state has odd parity, as we discuss in detail below.

The even parity eigenstate wavefunction of a double square well with a barrier height of V_0 in between is [46]

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\text{even}} \begin{cases} = A\sin k_+(x_1-x_2-b) & a<x_1-x_2<b \quad \text{region I} \\ = B\cosh\kappa_+(x_1-x_2) & -a<x_1-x_2<a \quad \text{region II} \\ = -A\sin k_+(x_1-x_2+b) & -b<x_1-x_2<-a \quad \text{region III}\,, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where k_+ and κ_+ are related to the energy E by

$$E=\frac{\hbar^2k_+^2}{2m}=V_0-\frac{\hbar^2\kappa_+^2}{2m}\,. \tag{3.2}$$

The odd parity wavefunction is

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\text{odd}} \begin{cases} = A\sin k_-(x_1-x_2-b) & a<x_1-x_2<b \quad \text{region I} \\ = B\sinh\kappa_-(x_1-x_2) & -a<x_1-x_2<a \quad \text{region II} \\ = A\sin k_-(x_1-x_2+b) & -b<x_1-x_2<-a \quad \text{region III}\,, \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

where x_1 and x_2 denote the positions of the two particles. The momenta k_-, κ_- are



Figure 3: Square well.

related to the energy E by the analogous relation (3.2). This means that

$$V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2(k_+^2 + \kappa_+^2)}{2m} = \frac{\hbar^2(k_-^2 + \kappa_-^2)}{2m} \tag{3.4}$$

We will consider the limit where we can solve the double well problem entirely analytically. There is a limit in which the eigenvalues can be obtained perturbatively without resorting to numerics.

Physically, we are expecting that the wavefunction in region I and III being very close to the ground state of the wells where they can be very well approximated by infinite wells, up to exponentially suppressed tails that leak into region II. Using this knowledge therefore, we set $\delta k_\pm = (\pi - \epsilon_\pm)$ where $\delta = b - a.$, and we take $\epsilon_\pm \ll 1$. The continuity conditions of the wavefunction at the walls lead to consistency conditions that constrain the eigenvalues $k_\pm$ and $\kappa_\pm$. For the even parity wavefunction, the consistency condition is

$$k_+ \cot(b-a)k_+ = -\kappa_+ \tanh a\kappa_+, \tag{3.5}$$

and we get,

$$k_+ = \kappa_+\epsilon_+[1 - e^{-2a\kappa_+}]. \tag{3.6}$$

Similarly for the odd parity wavefunction, we get

$$k_- = \kappa_-\epsilon_-[1 + 2e^{-2a\kappa_-}]. \tag{3.7}$$

As $\epsilon_\pm$ are small so $k_\pm$ is very small compared to $\kappa_\pm$. Note however that $\kappa_\pm a$ are independent sets of dimensionless quantities, and to ensure that the tunnelling across the wells are exponentially suppressed, we will take $\kappa_\pm a$ to be large. Now using this we can solve for δ in terms of say ϵ_-.

$$\pi - \epsilon_- = \delta\,\kappa_-\epsilon_-[1 - 2e^{-2a\kappa_-}]. \tag{3.8}$$

Upto the order we are interested in we get

$$\delta = \frac{\pi}{\kappa_-\epsilon_-}(1 - \frac{\epsilon_-}{\pi} - 2e^{-2a\kappa_-}). \tag{3.9}$$

For the later convenience we can set

$$\kappa_- = 1. \tag{3.10}$$

Also we make the substitution

$$a = \frac{\alpha}{\kappa_-}. \tag{3.11}$$

As promised, $\alpha \gg 1$ but it's zeroth order in ϵ. We have chosen to do a double expansion, in $1/\alpha$ and ϵ independently. To churn out physics out of a complicated expressions with many independent dimensionless quantities, some concession is necessary. Next we define

$$\kappa_+ = \kappa_- + \delta\kappa \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\epsilon_+ = \epsilon_- + \delta\epsilon. \tag{3.13}$$

Using (3.4) and

$$\frac{\pi - \epsilon_+}{\pi - \epsilon_-} = \frac{\kappa_+\epsilon_+[1 - e^{-2a\kappa_+}]}{\kappa_-\epsilon_-[1 + 2e^{-2a\kappa_-}]}\,, \tag{3.14}$$

we can solve for $\delta\kappa$ and $\delta\epsilon$. Finally we get

$$\delta\kappa = \frac{4\epsilon_-^3\kappa}{\pi}e^{-2a\kappa_-} \tag{3.15}$$

and

$$\delta\epsilon = 4\epsilon_- e^{-2a\kappa_-}. \tag{3.16}$$

Now using (3.15),(3.16) and (3.6), we can write

$$k_+ = k_- + \delta k\,, \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\delta k = -\frac{4k\epsilon_- e^{-2a\kappa_-}}{\pi}\,. \tag{3.18}$$

Normalising the wavefunctions and solving for the continuity conditions, we have

$$A_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L\delta}}(1 - \frac{\epsilon_-}{2\pi}(1 + 4e^{-2a\kappa_-}))\,, \tag{3.19}$$

$$A_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L\delta}}(1 - \frac{\epsilon_-}{2\pi})\,, \tag{3.20}$$

$$B_- = -\frac{2\,\epsilon_-}{\sqrt{L\delta}}e^{-a\kappa_-}(1 + e^{-2a\kappa_-})\,, \tag{3.21}$$

$$B_+ = \frac{2\epsilon_- e^{-a\kappa_-}}{\sqrt{L\delta}}(1 + 2e^{-2a\kappa_-}). \tag{3.22}$$

Typically the trace of the density matrix is divergent due to the space time volume divergence. So to regulate that we put a cut-off L to normalise the wavefunction. Finally, we compute the reduced density matrix and obtain from it the $n = 2$ Rényi entropy

$$S_2 = -\ln(\operatorname{tr}\rho_A^2)\,. \tag{3.23}$$

Expanding in ϵ and $1/\alpha$ and keep the first leading terms

$$\begin{aligned} L\operatorname{tr}\rho_A^2 =& \left[\frac{(1-2e^{-2\alpha})}{12\pi\epsilon}\Big(153+20\pi^2-36\cos(\Delta Et)-(60+8\pi^2)\cos(2\Delta Et)\Big)\right] \\ &+\left[\left\{\frac{(1+2\pi^2)e^{-2\alpha}}{2\pi^2}-\frac{26\,(6+\pi^2)\,e^{-4\alpha}}{3\pi^2}\right\}- \right. \\ &\left\{\left(1+\frac{4\,(3+\pi^2)\,e^{-2\alpha}}{3\,\pi^2}-\frac{20\,(3+\pi^2)\,e^{-4\alpha}}{3\pi^2}\right)\cos(\Delta Et)\right\} \\ &\left.-\left\{\left(e^{-2\alpha}-\frac{10\,(3+\pi^2)\,e^{-4\alpha}}{3\pi^2}\right)\cos(2\Delta Et)\right\}\right]+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon,\exp(-6\alpha)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Note that there isn't any linear t contribution. We will make more detailed comparison with a field theoretic instanton calculation in our forth-coming publication [43]. Let us note however that the exponentially suppressed factors play exactly the same role as instantons, and that at small t the time dependence starts at $t^2\Delta E^2 \sim t^2\exp(-4a)$ which is suppressed compared to the leading time-independent instanton contributions. This is highly reminiscent of our field theoretic result in [43].

4 Free Majorana fermions

In $(1+1)$ dimension, a Majorana field satisfying the Dirac equation with $\gamma^\mu = (\sigma_y, i\sigma_x)$ has the form [47]

$$\psi = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2E}}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{E+k}}\begin{pmatrix}E+k\\ i\mu\end{pmatrix}b_k+\frac{1}{\sqrt{E-k}}\begin{pmatrix}E-k\\ -i\mu\end{pmatrix}b^\dagger_{-k}\right]e^{ikx}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

The computation of entanglement using the wavefunction method particularly for free field theory has been considered before [24]. What we would like to emphasize here, is that the local basis in configuration space is related to the mode operators b and $b^\dagger$ that defines the Lorentz invariant vacuum in the specific way because of causality. This linear combination is dictated uniquely by the vanishing of commutators for space-like separation. See for example [48] for a detailed discussion. Therefore, perhaps expected, the large amount of entanglement in configuration space follows from Lorentz invariance. This fact should already be apparent in the Unruh effect relevant particularly in the case of half-space entanglement.

Let us consider a Bogoliubov transformation which transforms the set of operators b_k to the following set of operators [42]

$$\psi = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)} \begin{pmatrix} a_{1k} \\ a_{2k} \end{pmatrix} e^{ikx} \,. \tag{4.2}$$

The two sets of operators are related by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{1k} \\ a_{2k} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{E+k} & \sqrt{E-k} \\ \frac{i\mu}{\sqrt{E+k}} & \frac{-i\mu}{\sqrt{E-k}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_k \\ b^\dagger_{-k} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.3}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{E+k} & \sqrt{E-k} \\ i\sqrt{E-k} & -i\sqrt{E+k} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_k \\ b^\dagger_{-k} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.4}$$

One can express $(b_k, b^\dagger_{-k})$ in terms of (a_{1k}, a_{2k})

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_k \\ b^\dagger_{-k} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2E}} \begin{pmatrix} -i\sqrt{E+k} & -\sqrt{E-k} \\ -i\sqrt{E-k} & \sqrt{E+k} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{1k} \\ a_{2k} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.5}$$

Here, the two sets of operators $(a_{1k}, a^\dagger_{1k})$ and $(a_{2k}, a^\dagger_{2k})$ are identified as the creation and annihilation operators $(a_k, a^\dagger_k)$ and $(a^\dagger_{-k}, a_{-k})$ of the Fourier modes. Let us define a vacuum $|0\rangle_m$ which is annihilated by the operator b_k

$$b_k \, |0\rangle_m = 0 \,. \tag{4.6}$$

Hence, the new set of operators satisfy the equation

$$\left(\sqrt{\frac{E+k}{2E}} a_k - i \sqrt{\frac{E-k}{2E}} a^\dagger_{-k} \right) |0\rangle_m = 0 \,. \tag{4.7}$$

The vacuum can be expressed in terms of a state constructed from the new set of operators

$$|0\rangle_m = \frac{1}{\gamma} e^{-\sum_k c_k a^\dagger_k a^\dagger_{-k}} \, |0\rangle \tag{4.8}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\gamma} \prod_k \left(1 - c_k a^\dagger_k a^\dagger_{-k} \right) |0\rangle \ , \tag{4.9}$$

where γ is the normalisation factor, $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum defined by $a_k \, |0\rangle = 0$ and the coefficients c_k are fixed by equation (4.7)

$$c_k = -i \sqrt{\frac{E-k}{E+k}} = -i \frac{E-k}{m} \,. \tag{4.10}$$

Let us now consider a system with finite number of sites. The inverse Fourier transform of the operator a_k is

$$a_k = \sum_N a_N e^{-ikN} \,, \tag{4.11}$$

where N is the site label. The vacuum with respect to the operator b_k can now be written as

$$|0\rangle_m = \frac{1}{\gamma} \prod_k \left(1 - \sum_{NL} c_k e^{ik(N-L)} a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle \ . \tag{4.12}$$

Let us now consider a state $|\Psi\rangle$ which is constructed from two vacua defined by two sets of operators of the form (4.1) with mass m_1 and m_2, respectively.

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} |0\rangle_{m_1} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2} |0\rangle_{m_2} \tag{4.13}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\gamma\gamma_1} \prod_k \left(1 - \sum_{NL} c_k e^{ik(N-L)} a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\gamma\gamma_2} \prod_k \left(1 - \sum_{NL} \tilde{c}_k e^{ik(N-L)} a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle \tag{4.14}$$

Assuming $m_1, m_2 \gg \frac{1}{\tilde{L}}$, where $\tilde{L}$ is the lattice spacing, the state can be simplified to

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sum_k \sum_{NL} c_k e^{ik(N-L)} a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sum_k \sum_{NL} \tilde{c}_k e^{ik(N-L)} a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle \tag{4.15}$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{NL} \left(c_k + \tilde{c}_k\right) e^{ik(N-L)} a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle \tag{4.16}$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{NL} C_k f_{NL}^k a_N^\dagger a_L^\dagger\right) |0\rangle \ , \tag{4.17}$$

where $C_k = c_k + \tilde{c}_k$ and $f_{NL}^k = e^{ik(N-L)}$. To compute the entanglement entropy, the configuration space is divided into two regions A and $\bar{A}$, where the sites in each region are labelled by small letters (n) and small letters with bar ($\bar{n}$), respectively. The state $|\Psi\rangle$ is

$$|\Psi\rangle = \Big(1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{nl} C_k f_{nl}^k a_n^\dagger a_l^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} C_k f_{\bar{n}\bar{l}}^k a_{\bar{n}}^\dagger a_{\bar{l}}^\dagger \tag{4.18}$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{\bar{n}l} C_k \tilde{f}_{\bar{n}l}^k a_{\bar{n}}^\dagger a_l^\dagger\Big) |0\rangle \ , \tag{4.19}$$

where $\tilde{f}_{\bar{n}l}^k = f_{\bar{n}l}^k - f_{l\bar{n}}^k$.

A reduced density matrix of ρ_A is constructed by tracing out the degrees of freedom

in region $\bar{A}$

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_{\bar{A}}\left(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|\right) \tag{4.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left[\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_{nl} C_k f^k_{nl} a^\dagger_n a^\dagger_l\right)|0\rangle_{AA}\langle 0|\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k'}\sum_{n'l'} C^*_{k'} f^{*k'}_{n'l'} a_{n'} a_{l'}\right)\right]_{\bar{A}}\langle 0|0\rangle_{\bar{A}} \\
&+ |0\rangle_{AA}\langle 0|\left[{}_{\bar{A}}\langle 0|\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k'}\sum_{\bar{n}'\bar{l}'} C^*_{k'} f^{*k'}_{\bar{l}'\bar{n}'} a_{\bar{l}'} a_{\bar{n}'}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} C_k f^k_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} a^\dagger_{\bar{n}} a^\dagger_{\bar{l}}\right)|0\rangle_{\bar{A}}\right] \\
&+ a^\dagger_l|0\rangle_{AA}\langle 0|a_{l'}\left[{}_{\bar{A}}\langle 0|\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k'}\sum_{\bar{n}'l'} C^*_{k'}\tilde{f}^{*k'}_{l'\bar{n}'} a_{\bar{n}'}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_{\bar{n}l} C_k \tilde{f}^k_{\bar{n}l} a^\dagger_{\bar{n}}\right)|0\rangle_{\bar{A}}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

This expressions is already quite revealing. One can see that the first line and the second line together actually leads to no entanglement. They contain operators acting inside A exclusively or $\bar{A}$. The third line explains the large amount of entanglement between region A and $\bar{A}$ – entanglement is created when pairs of particles are created, one inside A and the other in $\bar{A}$. And as we shall see below, these particles that are created cannot be separated by too large a distance – the amplitude for such creation is suppressed exponentially by separation, and the suppression depends on the mass of the particle. This is the intuitive picture of the area law, as expected. (To prove it for massless theories using this method one would have to work harder but for now let us satisfy ourselves with a massive theory.)

Tracing out the degrees of freedom in region $\bar{A}$ gives the following coefficients in ρ_A

$$\kappa_0 = {}_{\bar{A}}\langle 0|\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k'}\sum_{\bar{n}'\bar{l}'} C^*_{k'} f^{*k'}_{\bar{l}'\bar{n}'} a_{\bar{l}'} a_{\bar{n}'}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} C_k f^k_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} a^\dagger_{\bar{n}} a^\dagger_{\bar{l}}\right)|0\rangle_{\bar{A}} \tag{4.22}$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}\sum_{kk'}\sum_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} C^*_{k'} C_k\left(-f^{*k'}_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} f^k_{\bar{n}\bar{l}} + f^{*k'}_{\bar{l}\bar{n}} f^k_{\bar{n}\bar{l}}\right), \tag{4.23}$$

$${}_{\bar{A}}\langle 0|\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k'}\sum_{\bar{n}'l'} C^*_{k'}\tilde{f}^{*k'}_{l'\bar{n}'} a_{\bar{n}'}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_{\bar{n}l} C_k \tilde{f}^k_{\bar{n}l} a^\dagger_{\bar{n}}\right)|0\rangle_{\bar{A}} \tag{4.24}$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}\sum_{kk'}\sum_{\bar{n}ll'} C^*_{k'} C_k \tilde{f}^{*k'}_{l'\bar{n}}\tilde{f}^k_{\bar{n}l}. \tag{4.25}$$

The reduced density matrix ρ_A is then

$$\rho_A = (1+\kappa_0)|0\rangle\langle 0| + |2\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 2| + |1\rangle\langle 1| + |2\rangle\langle 2|, \tag{4.26}$$

where the subscript label A for the vacuum in region A is dropped,

$$|2\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_{nl} C_k f^k_{nl} a^\dagger_n a^\dagger_l|0\rangle, \tag{4.27}$$

$$|1\rangle\langle 1| = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{kk'}\sum_{\bar{n}ll'} C^*_{k'} C_k \tilde{f}^{*k'}_{l'\bar{n}}\tilde{f}^k_{\bar{n}l} a^\dagger_l|0\rangle\langle 0|a_{l'}. \tag{4.28}$$

Let us consider the second Rényi entropy S_2. The square of the reduced density matrix is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A^2 = &\left((1+\kappa_0)^2+\kappa_2\right)|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1+\kappa_0+\kappa_2)|0\rangle\langle 2| + (1+\kappa_0+\kappa_2)|2\rangle\langle 0| \\ &+ \kappa_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + (1+\kappa_2)|2\rangle\langle 2| \,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

The coefficients κ_1 and κ_2 are given by

$$\kappa_1 |1\rangle\langle 1| = |1\rangle\langle 1|1\rangle\langle 1| \tag{4.30}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{4}\sum_{kk'}\sum_{\bar{n}lp} C^*_{k'}C_k \tilde{f}^{*k'}_{p\bar{n}}\tilde{f}^{k}_{\bar{n}l} a_l^\dagger|0\rangle\langle 0| a_p\right)\left(\frac{1}{4}\sum_{k''k'''}\sum_{\bar{n}'l'q} C^*_{k'''}C_{k''}\tilde{f}^{*k'''}_{l'\bar{n}'}\tilde{f}^{k''}_{\bar{n}'q} a_q^\dagger|0\rangle\langle 0| a_{l'}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{16}\sum_{kk'k''k'''}\sum_{\bar{n}\bar{n}'ll'p} C^*_{k'}C_k C^*_{k'''}C_{k''}\tilde{f}^{*k'}_{p\bar{n}}\tilde{f}^{k}_{\bar{n}l}\tilde{f}^{*k'''}_{l'\bar{n}'}\tilde{f}^{k''}_{\bar{n}'p} a_l^\dagger|0\rangle\langle 0| a_{l'}\,, \tag{4.31}$$

$$\kappa_2 = \langle 2|2\rangle \tag{4.32}$$

$$= \langle 0|\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k'}\sum_{n'l'} C^*_{k'} f^{*k'}_{l'n'} a_{l'}a_{n'}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k}\sum_{nl} C_k f^{k}_{nl} a_n^\dagger a_l^\dagger\right)|0\rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}\sum_{kk'}\sum_{nl} C^*_{k'}C_k\left(-f^{*k'}_{nl}f^{k}_{nl} + f^{*k'}_{ln}f^{k}_{nl}\right)\,. \tag{4.33}$$

S_2 is computed by taking the trace of (4.29)

$$S_2 = -\ln \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_A^2 \tag{4.34}$$

$$= -\ln\left((1+\kappa_0)^2+\kappa_2+|\kappa_1|+(1+\kappa_2)\kappa_2\right)\,, \tag{4.35}$$

where $|\kappa_1|$ is given by

$$|\kappa_1| = \frac{1}{16}\sum_{kk'k''k'''}\sum_{\bar{n}\bar{n}'lp} C^*_{k'}C_k C^*_{k'''}C_{k''}\tilde{f}^{*k'}_{p\bar{n}}\tilde{f}^{k}_{\bar{n}l}\tilde{f}^{*k'''}_{l\bar{n}'}\tilde{f}^{k''}_{\bar{n}'p}\,. \tag{4.36}$$

5 Interpretation

The coefficients C_k control the range of the interaction. The factor $\sum_k C_k f^k_{nl}$ can be converted to an integral by taking a continuum limit with an IR cut-off of the order of the mass m and the inverse lattice spacing $\frac{1}{\tilde{L}}$ as the UV cut-off, respectively.

$$F_{nl} = \sum_k C_k f_{nl}^k \sim \int_{\tilde{c}m}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{L}}} dk \left(\frac{E-k}{m}\right) e^{ik(n-l)a} \tag{5.1}$$

$$\approx F(x) \approx \int_{\tilde{c}m}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{L}}} dk \left(\frac{E-k}{m}\right) e^{ikx} \tag{5.2}$$

$$\approx \int_{\tilde{c}m}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{L}}} dk \, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m}{k}\right) e^{ikx} \,, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\tilde{c}$ is a constant. The integral is simplified by keeping only the first order term in the expansion of the energy E in powers of $\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)^2$. It is evaluated numerically and is shown in Figure 4.



Figure 4: The solid and dashed curves represent the real and imaginary parts of the integral, respectively. The amplitude of both curves decreases quickly with distance, and the long range contribution averages to zero due to the oscillatory behaviour. $m = 1$, $\tilde{c} = 0.1$ and $\tilde{L} = 0.001$ are used in this plot.

This shows that the interaction between sites is short range. Only the sites near the boundary contribute to the entanglement entropy. Hence, an area law is expected in this model [3].

6 Discussions

In this note, we attempt to study the physics of non-perturbative, or more specifically, instanton corrections to the entanglement entropy in a general many body system moti-

[3]Interested readers are referred to some these references [49, 50] for computation of entanglement entropy for squeezed states in various other situations. The list is by no means complete and interested readers are encouraged to refer to the citations and references of these papers.

vated by field theory. We pursue a strategy that focuses on the wavefunction itself. To set the stage, we look at the toy model of a many particle system where the two-particle potential has multiple minima. We apply the method of writing down explicit wavefunctions that describe the true ground states as in the case of field theory [43]. The trick used here is the Bogoliubov transformation. Its utility is demonstrated in the simple case of Majorana fermions in 1+1 dimensions, where the minima are massive. As a first test, we demonstrate that the area law is expected to hold. Our method attempts to attack the physics of the problem directly, which gives a very clear picture to the nature of the entanglement. In field theory, it can be understood as arising from pair creations of particles across a region and its complement dictated in a way demanded by Lorentz symmetry. We have so far restricted our discussion to the toy model of fermions, but the same method should be readily applicable to bosons. More interestingly, we would like to explore how these methods can be applied also to gauge theories. That should provide a more direct insight to the nature of quantum entanglement in the ground states of gauge theories, and a handle to the reduced density matrix and its spectra.

Acknowledgements

Authors would like to thank Horacio Casini for valuable comments. AB and LYH would like to acknowledge support by the Thousand Young Talents Program, and Fudan University. SNL would like to acknowledge support by Fudan University. AB, PCHL and LYH would like thank the organizer of the " YKIS 2016: Quantum Matter, Spacetime and Information" conference held at YITP, Kyoto in June13-17 where a part of this work was completed. PHCL thanks the hospitality of Fudan University and he is supported by JSPS postdoctoral fellowship for overseas researchers. Finally, AB, PHCL and LYH would like to thank Charles Melby-Thompson for various stimulating discussions and collaboration on a forthcoming paper [43] related to this topic.

A Appendix

A.1 False vacuum tunnelling

Let us go back to the 2-particle system and consider a configuration where the two particles are at the minimum $x = x_1 - x_2 = 0$ at $t = 0$. The particles will tunnell back and forth from $x = 0$ to the other minimum $x = a$

$$|\Psi_k(t, x_1, x_2)\rangle = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{2} \sum_{x_1, x_2} e^{ikX} \left[|+\rangle + e^{i\Delta t} |-\rangle \right] , \qquad |\pm\rangle = |x = 0\rangle \pm |x = a\rangle , \tag{A.1}$$

where Δ is the energy difference between the ground state and the first excited state. The reduced density matrix of this state is

$$\rho_1 = \mathcal{N}^2 \sum_{x_1} \left(|x_1\rangle \langle x_1| - i\frac{\sin \Delta t}{2} e^{i\frac{k}{M}m_1 a} |x_1\rangle \langle x_1 + a| + i\frac{\sin \Delta t}{2} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}m_1 a} |x_1\rangle \langle x_1 - a| \right) . \tag{A.2}$$

The only difference from (2.4) is the additional sine factor in the off-diagonal terms. The contribution to $\mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_1^n$ from m hops follows almost from previous consideration but a slight modification and is

$$f_n(m) = \mathcal{N}^{2n} \frac{n!}{m!m!(n-2m)!} \left(\frac{\sin \Delta t}{2} \right)^{2m} . \tag{A.3}$$

Then the total contribution is

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_1^n = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^2} \sum_{m=0}^{|n/2|} f_n(m) = \mathcal{N}^{2(n-1)} {}_2F_1\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n}{2}, -\frac{n}{2}, 1, \sin^2 \Delta t \Big) , \tag{A.4}$$

where ${}_2F_1$ is the hypergeometric function. A lower bound of the entanglement entropy is given by the second Rényi entropy S_2 as

$$S_2 = \mathcal{N}^4 \left(1 + \frac{\sin^2 \Delta t}{2} \right) . \tag{A.5}$$

Note that the leading time dependence in the ($\Delta t \ll 1$) limit is proportional to $\Delta^2 t^2$. This suggest that the contribution is subleading compared to the usual instanton result in a field theory.

We note that it is actually possible to have a linear time dependence in the Rényi entropy. Had we considered the following wave-function:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{\sqrt{2}} (A|+\rangle + Be^{i\Delta t}|-\rangle), \qquad |A|^2 + \ |B|^2 = 1, \tag{A.6}$$

with generic complex numbers A and B. The final result for the Rényi entropy is given by

$$S_n = \frac{\ln \mathrm{tr}(\rho_A^n)}{1-n} \qquad \mathrm{tr}(\rho_A^n) = \mathcal{N}^{2(n-1)} {}_2F_1\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n}{2}, -\frac{n}{2}, 1, \sigma_+\sigma_- \Big), \tag{A.7}$$

where we define

$$\sigma_+ = |A|^2 - |B|^2 \pm 2iA\bar{B} \sin \Delta t \qquad \sigma_- = \bar{\sigma}_+. \tag{A.8}$$

A linear t dependence appears as soon as A and B become complex numbers.

A.2 Multi-particle

This section presents an alternative method of computing the Rényi entropy of the multi-particle system. We start with the wavefunction for N particles written in a similar form as in the two-particle case (2.3).

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_k\rangle =&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N}}\sum_{\{x_i\}}\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} e^{ikX}\Big(\delta(x_{i+1}-x_i)+\delta(x_{i+1}-x_i-a)\Big)\\ &\times\Big(\delta(x_N-x_1)+\delta(x_N-x_1-a)\Big)\,|x_1\cdots x_N\rangle\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{A.9}$$

The density matrix of the system is then

$$\rho=|\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k|\tag{A.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}=&\frac{1}{2^N}\sum_{\{x_i\},\{y_i\}}\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} e^{ik(X-Y)}\\ &\times\Big(\delta(x_{i+1}-x_i)+\delta(x_{i+1}-x_i-a)\Big)\Big(\delta(y_{i+1}-y_i)+\delta(y_{i+1}-y_i-a)\Big)\\ &\times\Big(\delta(x_N-x_1)+\delta(x_N-x_1-a)\Big)\Big(\delta(y_{2N}-y_1)+\delta(y_{2N}-y_1-a)\Big)\\ &\times|x_1\cdots x_N\rangle\langle y_1\cdots y_N|\ .\end{aligned}\tag{A.11}$$

If one traces out the particles $(m+1,\cdots,N)$, the following reduced density matrix is obtained

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A=&\frac{1}{2^N}\sum_{x_m,y_m} e^{i\frac{k}{M}m_m(x_m-y_m)}\sum_{x_1,y_1} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}m_j(x_1-y_1)}\\ &\times\sum_{\tilde{k}_1=0}^{m-1}\delta(x_m-x_1-\tilde{k}_1a)\sum_{s=\tilde{k}_1-1}^{\tilde{k}_1}\Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-s}\sum_{\tilde{N}_2=\tilde{N}_1+1}^{m-s+1}\cdots\sum_{\tilde{N}_s=\tilde{N}_{s-1}+1}^{m-1} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\left(\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1}m_{i_1}+\cdots+\sum_{i_s=\tilde{N}_s}^{m-1}m_{i_s}\right)a}\Big]\\ &\times\sum_{\tilde{k}_2=0}^{m-1}\delta(y_m-y_1-\tilde{k}_2a)\sum_{s=\tilde{k}_2-1}^{\tilde{k}_2}\Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-s}\sum_{\tilde{N}_2=\tilde{N}_1+1}^{m-s+1}\cdots\sum_{\tilde{N}_s=\tilde{N}_{s-1}+1}^{m-1} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}\left(\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1}m_{i_1}+\cdots+\sum_{i_s=\tilde{N}_s}^{m-1}m_{i_s}\right)a}\Big]\\ &\times\sum_{x_N}\Big(\sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^{N-m}C_{\tilde{k}}^{N-m}\,\delta(x_N-x_m-\tilde{k}a)\delta(x_m-y_m)\\ &\quad+\sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^{N-m-1}C_{\tilde{k}}^{N-m-1}\,\delta(x_N-x_m-\tilde{k}a)\delta(x_m-y_m-a)\\ &\quad+\sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^{N-m}C_{\tilde{k}}^{N-m}\,\delta(x_N-x_m-\tilde{k}a)\delta(y_m-x_m-a)\Big)\end{aligned}\tag{A.12}$$

$$\times \Big(\delta(x_N - x_1) + \delta(x_N - x_1 - a)\Big)\Big(\delta(x_N - y_1) + \delta(x_N - y_1 - a)\Big)$$
$$\times |x_1 \cdots x_m\rangle \langle y_1 \cdots y_m| \ . \tag{A.13}$$

The δ-functions constrain the allowed value of $(\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2, \tilde{k}_3)$. A total of 8 different types of the components of the reduced density matrix is obtained.

$$\frac{(N-m)+1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} |x_N, \cdots, x_N\rangle \langle x_N, \cdots, x_N| \ , \tag{A.14}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}\tilde{m}_j a} \Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-1} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1} m_{i_1} a} \Big] |x_N - a, \cdots, x_N\rangle \langle x_N, \cdots, x_N| \ , \tag{A.15}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}\tilde{m}_j a} \Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-1} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1} m_{i_1} a} \Big] |x_N, \cdots, x_N\rangle \langle x_N - a, \cdots, x_N| \ , \tag{A.16}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} \Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-1} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1} m_{i_1} a} \Big] \Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-1} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1} m_{i_1} a} \Big] |x_N - a, \cdots, x_N\rangle \langle x_N - a, \cdots, x_N| \ , \tag{A.17}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} e^{i\frac{k}{M} m_m a} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} m_j a} |x_N, \cdots, x_N\rangle \langle x_N - a, \cdots, x_N - a| \ , \tag{A.18}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} e^{i\frac{k}{M} m_m a} \Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-1} e^{i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1} m_{i_1} a} \Big] |x_N - a, \cdots x_N\rangle \langle x_N - a, \cdots, x_N - a| \ , \tag{A.19}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} e^{-i\frac{k}{M} m_m a} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} m_j a} |x_N - a \cdots x_N - a\rangle \langle x_N, \cdots, x_N| \ , \tag{A.20}$$

$$\frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{x_N} e^{-i\frac{k}{M} m_m a} \Big[\sum_{\tilde{N}_1=2}^{m-1} e^{-i\frac{k}{M}\sum_{i_1=\tilde{N}_1}^{m-1} m_{i_1} a} \Big] |x_N - a \cdots x_N - a\rangle \langle x_N - a \cdots, x_N| \ . \tag{A.21}$$

The second Rényi entropy is

$$S_2 = -\ln \left[\left(\frac{1}{2^N}\right)^2 \left(N^2 + 2(m-1)^2 + 4(m-1) - 2N(m-1) + 2\right) \right] \tag{A.22}$$

$$= -\ln \left[\left(\frac{1}{2^N}\right)^2 \left(N^2 \left(\left(1 - \frac{2}{N}\right) + 2\left(\frac{m}{N}\right)^2 - 2\left(\frac{m}{N}\right) \right) \right) \right] \ , \tag{A.23}$$

which matches with (2.22).

A.3 Double well tunnelling revisited

In section 3, we discussed the 2 well potential in the limit that $k \ll \kappa$ and made some connections with instantons [43]. Here, we would like to look for an alternative limit, in which $k \gg \kappa$. In this case the result takes a very similar form, but it does not have a simple semi-classical interpretation in terms of instantons. Nonetheless, we consider it for completeness.

To take that limit, we follow the following procedure:
1.) We will first assume $b - a = \delta$ is very small so the well is very thin and set $a = 1$.
2.) Next, set $k_+ = \frac{1}{\delta}(\frac{\pi}{2} + \epsilon)$ and $k = \frac{1}{\delta}(\frac{\pi}{2} + \epsilon)$, where ϵ is a very small number.
3.) Finally, we will carry out all the calculations by taking this double limit $\delta \to 0$ and $\epsilon \to 0$ such that the ratio of $\frac{\epsilon}{\delta} = \tilde{\alpha}$ remains finite.
Basically the consequence of these assumptions is that, the region II becomes very large and region III and I become very small. The wavefunction raises sharply in region III which reaches its maxima near $x_1 - x_2 = -a$, then decays very slowly in region II until it reaches its minima around the middle of region II. Then it raised again very slowly upto $x_1 - x_2 = a$ and finally decays very fast in region I. The length scale governing this in region I is $\frac{1}{k}$ which is smaller than the length scale $\frac{1}{\kappa}$ in region II. The consistency conditions coming from matching the wavefunction and its derivative at the boundary between region I and region II give the following condition

$$\kappa_\pm(1 \mp 2e^{-2\kappa_\pm a}) = k_\pm \epsilon \,. \tag{A.24}$$

Then using the fact

$$k_+^2 + \kappa_+^2 = k_-^2 + \kappa_-^2, \tag{A.25}$$

and assuming $\kappa_+ = \kappa_-$, we have

$$\frac{k_+}{k_-}^2 = 1 - 8\epsilon^2 e^{-2\kappa a} \,. \tag{A.26}$$

Note that typically κ is large but κa is very small. With our approximations, we can set

$$\kappa = \frac{\pi\tilde{\alpha}}{2}. \tag{A.27}$$

Next task is to determine the normalisation of the wavefunction A and B. First we look at the even parity wavefunction. One equation comes from the continuity of the wavefunction at the boundary

$$\frac{B}{A} = 2e^{-\kappa a}(1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}) \,. \tag{A.28}$$

Another condition comes from the normalisation of the total density matrix

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\rho = 1\,, \tag{A.29}$$

$$A^2 L\Big\{[(b-a) - \frac{\sin 2k_+(b-a)}{2k_+}] + \frac{B^2}{A^2}[a + \frac{\sinh 2\kappa a}{2\kappa}]\Big\} = 1\,. \tag{A.30}$$

Solving (A.28) and (A.30), we get

$$A^2 = \frac{\kappa}{L}(1 + e^{-4\kappa a})\,, \tag{A.31}$$

and

$$B^2 = 4\frac{\kappa}{L}e^{-2\kappa a}(1-\epsilon^2). \tag{A.32}$$

The wavefunction is translation invariant as it is a function of $x_1 - x_2$. All the expressions are independent of x_1 after the integration over x_2. The integration over x_1 gives the length of the system which is typically divergent, so we impose an upper limit cut-off L for the system size. For the odd parity wavefunction we also arrive at the same result for A and B. Next we use (A.27) and are left with only one parameter δ. In all the subsequent calculations, we will expand around $\delta = 0$ and extract the leading term. Now we want to compute the reduced density matrix for a wavefunction in a false vacuum and observe the effect of tunnelling to the entanglement entropy. Let us consider the following wavefunction

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha\,|+\rangle + \beta e^{i\Delta E t}\,|-\rangle\,. \tag{A.33}$$

$|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$ respectively denote the even and odd parity wavefunctions, and α and β can be complex in general but for simplicity we will set them to unity. ΔE is the energy splitting between the $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$ states and is proportional to $e^{-\kappa a}$. As we want to observe the leading effect of energy splitting to the entropy, only the leading exponential terms is extracted. By virtue of our expansion scheme discussed in the previous section, we can keep track of the power of this exponential without expanding it. The first couple of terms is sufficient for our purpose. The leading contribution is

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_A^2 = \frac{2}{L\,\delta^2}\left(\frac{5}{\pi\tilde{\alpha}} - \frac{8}{3}e^{-E\pi}\pi^2\tilde{\alpha}^2\right) + \cdots\,. \tag{A.34}$$

Note that the leading order is time independent. The time dependence typically comes from terms like $e^{-2\tilde{\alpha}\pi}E\cos(2\,\Delta E t)\sinh(2\tilde{\alpha}\pi)$. As ΔE is itself proportional to $e^{-\kappa a}$, it is subleading compared to the terms in (A.34). Substituting in $\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{2\kappa}{\pi}$ from (A.27), one obtains (in $a = 1$ convention)

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_A^2 = \frac{1}{L\,\delta^2}\Big(\frac{5}{\kappa} - \frac{64}{3}e^{-4\kappa}\kappa^2\Big). \tag{A.35}$$

References

[1] M. Levin and X. G. Wen, "Detecting Topological Order in a Ground State Wave Function," Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 110405. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.110405.

[2] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, "Topological entanglement entropy," Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 110404 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.110404 [hep-th/0510092].

[3] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen. "Symmetry protected topological orders in interacting bosonic systems," arXiv:1301.0861 [cond-mat.str-el]. X. G. Wen, "Classifying gauge anomalies through symmetry-protected trivial orders and classifying gravitational anomalies through topological orders," Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) no.4, 045013 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.045013 [arXiv:1303.1803 [hep-th]]. L. Kong and X. G. Wen, "Braided fusion categories, gravitational anomalies, and the mathematical framework for topological orders in any dimensions," arXiv:1405.5858 [cond-mat.str-el]. J. C. Wang, Z. C. Gu and X. G. Wen, "Field theory representation of gauge-gravity symmetry-protected topological invariants, group cohomology and beyond," Phys. Rev. Lett. **114** (2015) no.3, 031601 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.031601 [arXiv:1405.7689 [cond-mat.str-el]].

[4] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, "Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT," Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 181602 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.181602 [hep-th/0603001].

[5] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, "Aspects of Holographic Entanglement Entropy," JHEP **0608** (2006) 045 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/08/045 [hep-th/0605073].

[6] B. Swingle, "Entanglement Renormalization and Holography," Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 065007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.065007 [arXiv:0905.1317 [cond-mat.str-el]].

[7] F. Pastawski, B. Yoshida, D. Harlow and J. Preskill, "Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: Toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence," JHEP **1506** (2015) 149 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)149 [arXiv:1503.06237 [hep-th]]. P. Hayden, S. Nezami, X. L. Qi, N. Thomas, M. Walter and Z. Yang, "Holographic duality from random tensor networks," arXiv:1601.01694 [hep-th]. A. Bhattacharyya, Z. S. Gao, L. Y. Hung and S. N. Liu, "Exploring the Tensor Networks/AdS Correspondence," arXiv:1606.00621 [hep-th].

[8] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico and A. Kitaev, Entanglement in quantum critical phenomena, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 227902 (2003) [arXiv:quant-ph/0211074].

[9] J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, G. Vidal, Ground state entanglement in quantum spin chains, Quant. Inf. and Comp. 4, 048 (2004) [arXiv:quant-ph/0304098].

[10] M. Srednicki, Entropy and area, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 666 (1993) [arXiv:hep-th/9303048].

[11] I. Peschel, On the entanglement entropy for a XY spin chain, JSTAT, P12005 (2004) [arXiv:cond-mat/0410416].

[12] B. -Q. Jin, and V. E. Korepin, Quantum Spin Chain, Toeplitz Determinants and Fisher-Hartwig Conjecture, J. Stat. Phys. 116, 79 (2004) [arXiv:quant-ph/0304108].

[13] A. R. Its, B.Q. Jin, V. E. Korepin, Entanglement in XY Spin Chain, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 38, 2975 (2005) [arXiv:quant-ph/0409027].

[14] M. B. Plenio, J. Eisert, J. Dreissig and M. Cramer, Entropy, entanglement, and area: analytical results for harmonic lattice systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 060503 (2005) [arXiv:quant-ph/0405142]; An entanglement-area law for general bosonic harmonic lattice systems, Phys. Rev. A 73, 012309 (2006) [arXiv:quant-ph/0505092].

[15] S. Das and S. Shankaranarayanan, How robust is the entanglement entropy - area relation?, [arXiv:gr-qc/0511066].

[16] M. M. Wolf, Violation of the entropic area law for Fermions , Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 010404 (2006) [arXiv:quant-ph/0503219].

[17] D. Gioev, and I. Klich, Entanglement entropy of fermions in any dimension and the Widom conjecture, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 100503 (2006) [arXiv:quant-ph/0504151].

[18] T. Barthel, M.C. Chung, U. Schollwock, Entanglement scaling in critical twodimensional fermionic and bosonic systems, [arXiv:cond-mat/0602077].

[19] W. Li, L. Ding, R. Yu, T. Roscilde, S. Hass, Scaling Behavior of Entanglement in Two- and Three-Dimensional Free Fermions, [arXiv:quant-ph/0602094].

[20] R. Orus, Entanglement and majorization in (1+1)-dimensional quantum systems, Phys. Rev. A 71 (2005) 052327; Erratum-ibid. A 73 (2006) 019904 [arXiv:quant-ph/0501110].

[21] C. Holzhey, F. Larsen and F. Wilczek, Geometric and renormalized entropy in conformal field theory, Nucl. Phys. B 424, 443 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9403108].

[22] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory, J. Stat. Mech. 0406, P002 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0405152]; Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory: A non-technical introduction, [arXiv:quant-ph/0505193].

[23] H. Casini, C. D. Fosco and M. Huerta, Entanglement and alpha entropies for a massive Dirac field in two dimensions, J. Stat. Mech. 0507, P007 (2005) [arXiv:cond-mat/0505563].

[24] H. Casini and M. Huerta, "Entanglement entropy in free quantum field theory," J. Phys. A **42**, 504007 (2009) doi:10.1088/1751-8113/42/50/504007 [arXiv:0905.2562 [hep-th]].

[25] H. Casini and M. Huerta, Entanglement and alpha entropies for a massive scalar field in two dimensions, J. Stat. Mech. 0512, P012 (2005) [arXiv:cond-mat/0511014].

[26] M. A. Metlitski, C. A. Fuertes, S. Sachdev, "Entanglement entropy in the O(N) model," Phys. Rev. B **80** (2009) 115122.

[27] M. P. Hertzberg and F. Wilczek, "Some Calculable Contributions to Entanglement Entropy," Phys. Rev. Lett. **106** (2011) 050404 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.050404 [arXiv:1007.0993 [hep-th]].

[28] M. P. Hertzberg, "Entanglement Entropy in Scalar Field Theory," J. Phys. A **46** (2013) 015402 doi:10.1088/1751-8113/46/1/015402 [arXiv:1209.4646 [hep-th]].

[29] L. Y. Hung, R. C. Myers and M. Smolkin, "Some Calculable Contributions to Holographic Entanglement Entropy," JHEP **1108** (2011) 039 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2011)039 [arXiv:1105.6055 [hep-th]].

[30] H. Li, F. D. M. Haldane, " Entanglement Spectrum as a Generalization of Entanglement Entropy: Identification of Topological Order in Non-Abelian Fractional Quantum Hall Effect States," Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 010504.

[31] C. Chamon, A. Hamma, E. R. Mucciolo " Emergent Irreversibility and Entanglement Spectrum Statistics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 240501.

[32] S. R. Coleman, "The Fate of the False Vacuum. 1. Semiclassical Theory," Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2929 (1977) [Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1248 (1977)]. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.2929, 10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1248.
C. G. Callan, Jr. and S. R. Coleman, "The Fate of the False Vacuum. 2. First Quantum Corrections," Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1762 (1977). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1762.
S. R. Coleman, "The Uses of Instantons," Subnucl. Ser. **15**, 805 (1979).

[33] A. M. Polyakov, "Quark Confinement and Topology of Gauge Groups," Nucl. Phys. B **120**, 429 (1977). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(77)90086-4
C. G. Callan, Jr., R. F. Dashen and D. J. Gross, "Toward a Theory of the Strong Interactions," Phys. Rev. D **17** (1978) 2717. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.17.2717

[34] J. S. Schwinger, "Gauge Invariance and Mass. II.," Phys. Rev. **128**, 2425 (1962). doi:0.1103/PhysRev.128.2425
K. D. Rothe and J. A. Swieca, "Path Integral Representations for Tunneling Amplitudes in the Schwinger Model," Annals Phys. **117** (1979) 382.
S. Iso and H. Murayama, "Hamiltonian Formulation of the Schwinger Model: Nonconfinement and Screening of the Charge," Prog. Theor. Phys. **84** (1990) 142. doi:10.1143/PTP.84.142
S. Azakov, "The Schwinger model on a circle: Relation between Path integral and Hamiltonian approaches," Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21** (2006) 6593 doi:10.1142/S0217751X06034264 [hep-th/0511116].

[35] D. Berwanger and E. Grdel, Entangelement A Measure for the Complexity of Directed Graphs with Applications to Logic and Games, Proceedings of LPAR'04, vol. 3452 of LNCS, pp. 209223 (2004).

[36] L. Donetti,P. I. Hurtado and M. A. Munoz, "Entangled networks, synchronization and optimal network topology", arXiv:0502230[cond-mat].

[37] N. de Beaudrap, V. Giovannetti, S. Severini and R. Wilson, "Interpreting the von Neumann entropy of graph Laplacians, and coentropic graphs", arXiv:1304.7946[math.CO].

[38] J. G. Valatin, "Comments on the theory of superconductivity", Nuovo Cimento 7, 843 (1958)

[39] N Bogoliubov, "On the theory of superfluidity", J. Phys. (USSR), 11, p. 23 (1947).

[40] A. Fetter and J. Walecka, "Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems", Dover (2003) , C. Kittel," Quantum theory of solids", Wiley (1987).

[41] V. M .Strutinsky, "Shell effects in nuclear physics and deformation energies", Nuclear Physics A, Vol. 95, p. 420-442 (1967).

[42] K. Svozil, "Squeezed Fermion states", Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 3341-3343.

[43] A. Bhattacharyya, L. Y Hung, P. H. C. Lau and C. M. Thompson "Instanton corrections to entanglement entropy", to appear.

[44] T Giamarchi,"Quantum Physics in One Dimension", International Series of Monographs on Physics, Oxford University Press (2004).

[45] `https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spectral_graph_theory`

[46] D. J. Griffiths, "Introduction to Quantum Mechanics", Pearson Education(2005).

[47] L-Y. Hung , M. Smolkin and E. Sorkin, "(Non) supersymmetric quantum quenches", JHEP 1312 (2013) 022.

[48] S. Weinberg, "The Quantum theory of fields. Vol. 1: Foundations," Cambridge University Press (1995).

[49] E. Bianchi, L. Hackl and N. Yokomizo, "Entanglement entropy of squeezed vacua on a lattice," Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.8, 085045 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.085045 [arXiv:1507.01567 [hep-th]].

[50] T. Hiroshima, "Decoherence and Entanglement in Two-mode Squeezed Vacuum States", arXiv:quant-ph/0006100, Phys. Rev. A 63, 022305 (2001).